UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,272	02/14/2002	Robert K. Yang	1199-4	4926

7590 01/20/2006

Daniel A. Scola, Jr.
HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP
6900 Jericho Turnpike
Syosset, NY 11791

EXAMINER	
CHAN, SING P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1734	

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/074,272	YANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sing P. Chan	1734	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 54,55,62-78,80,81,83-91,93-104,106,108-112,114,116,117 and 119 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 54,55,62-78,80,81 and 83-90 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 91,93-104,106,108-112,114,116,117 and 119 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claim 119 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/768,809 in view of Yuhki et al (U.S. 5,044,761). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both recite combining a polymer component, an active component, and polar solvent, i.e. water, to form a matrix with a uniform distribution, forming a film from said matrix, providing a surface having top and bottom side, feeding said film onto said top side of said surface, and drying said film by applying heat to bottom side of said surface, which rapidly forming a visco-elastic film and prevent air flow migration and intermolecular forces from creating aggregates or conglomerates to maintain the uniform distribution of

components. Although, claim 119 of instant application does not recite the matrix include exposing the film to a temperature above a degradation temperature of the active component wherein the active component is maintained at a desired level, the claim does not exclude such limitation. The claim of copending application is silent as to deaerating the matrix by slow mixing. However, deaerating a mixture by mixing is well known and conventional as shown for example by Yuhki et al. Yuhki et al discloses a method of dissolving and deaerating powder material. The method includes feeding a liquid into tank, operating a motor at low to intermediate speeds to sufficiently stir a liquid, feeding a predetermined amount of powder material into the liquid, reducing pressure in tank (Col 4,lines 13-35) and switching the motor to high speed to provide a cavitation action to destroying the bubbles in the liquid (Col 4, lines 36-41), after a number of decompression, the motor is switched to low and returning the tank to atmospheric pressure and prevent the bubbles to be supplied into the solution again (Col 4, line 63 to Col 5, line 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to slowly stir the liquid and powder mixture to deaerate the mixture as disclosed by Yuhki et al in the method of copending application to dissolve powder material and to deaerated rapidly and easily with no bubbles being developed. (See Yuhki et al, Col 1, lines 5-11)

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 91-104, 106, 108-112, 114, 116, 117, and 119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. The term "slow mixing" in claims 91, 106, 110, 111, 114, 116, 117, and 119 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "slow mixing" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The specification does not recite at what speed the mixture is mixed, which is considered to be slow.

6. The term "controlling the mixing speed" in claims 101, 104, and 112 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "controlling the mixing speed" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The specification does not recite if there are more than one speed or ranges of speed to be controlled to deaerate the mixture.

7. The term "sufficiently slow speed" in claim 108 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "sufficiently slow speed" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one

of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The specification does not define what range or ranges of speed of mixing is sufficiently slow speed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 91, 93, 97, 100, 101, 106, 108,109, 111, 112, 114, 117, 119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zerbe et al (U.S. 6,660,292) in view of Strobush et al (U.S. 5,881,476) and Yuhki et al (U.S. 5,044,761).

Regarding claims 91, 93, 97, 100, 101, 106, 108, 109, 111, 112, 114, 117, and 119, Zerbe et al ('292) discloses a method of forming flavored film. The method includes providing a polymer component such as hydroxypropyl cellulose, modified starch, flavoring and other ingredients in water to form a solution, i.e. a matrix, coating the matrix onto a carrier substrate such as kraft paper or siliconized polyethylene-terephthalate film (Col 5, lines 36-45) and drying the film with hot air and removing the film after drying (Col 6, lines 43-50). Zerbe et al ('292) is silent as to the hot air is applied to the bottom of the substrate with air current's velocity at the bottom is higher than the top or substantially no top air flow to dry the film to rapidly forming a visco-elastic film and preventing air flow migration and intermolecular forces from forming

aggregates or conglomerates to maintaining compositional uniform distribution and deaerating the matrix by slow mixing. However, directing hot air to the bottom of the substrate with a higher air current at the bottom than the top or substantially no top air flow to dry the film is well known and conventional as shown for example by Strobush et al. Strobush et al discloses a method for drying a coating on a substrate. The method includes providing a substrate with a coating applied to a substrate (Col 8, line 66 to Col 9, line 8), providing a drying apparatus, feeding the coated substrate into the apparatus, where air foils (30) located below the coated substrate direct drying gas, i.e. heated air or hot air, to the bottom surface of the coated substrate (Col 9, lines 44-51) with air bars (34) to supply top-side gas or fresh air for added drying or to carry away evaporated solvent or no gas is supplied when top-side gas is not needed or desired (Col 11, lines 15-27) to dry the film without mottle defects, i.e. uniform thickness (Col 12, lines 27-31) or uniform density, which is without forming aggregates or conglomerates with uniform distribution of components.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to dry the coating on a substrate by directing drying gas to the bottom of the coated substrate as disclosed by Strobush et al in the method of Zerbe et al ('292) to dry the coating on a substrate without mottle and at a higher web speeds. (See Strobush et al, Col 6, lines 21-27) Zerbe et al ('292) as modified by Strobush et al is silent as to deaerating the mixture by slow mixing or controlling the mixing speed. However, deaerating a mixture by mixing is well known and conventional as shown for example by Yuhki et al. Yuhki et al discloses a method of dissolving and deaerating

powder material. The method includes feeding a liquid into tank, operating a motor at low to intermediate speeds to sufficiently stir a liquid, feeding a predetermined amount of powder material into the liquid, reducing pressure in tank (Col 4,lines 13-35) and switching the motor to high speed to provide a cavitation action to destroying the bubbles in the liquid (Col 4, lines 36-41), after a number of decompression, the motor is switched to low and returning the tank to atmospheric pressure and prevent the bubbles to be supplied into the solution again (Col 4, line 63 to Col 5, line 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to slowly stir the liquid and powder mixture to deaerate the mixture as disclosed by Yuhki et al in the method of Zerbe et al ('292) as modified by Strobush et al to dissolve powder material and to deaerated rapidly and easily with no bubbles being developed. (See Yuhki et al, Col 1, lines 5-11)

10. Claims 94 and 95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zerbe et al (U.S. 6,660,292) in view of Strobush et al (U.S. 5,881,476) and Yuhki et al (U.S. 5,044,761) as applied to claim 91 above, and further in view of Horstmann et al (U.S. 5,629,003).

Zerbe et al ('292) as modified above is silent as to the thickness of the film is at least 30 μm or at least 500 μm. However, forming an edible film with a thickness of at least 30 μm or at least 500 μm is well known and conventional as shown for example by Horstmann et al. Horstmann et al discloses a method of forming an edible film. The

method includes providing a polymer matrix with starch and water (Col 3, lines 49-67 and forming the coating layer to a thickness of 0.003 to 4 mm (Col 4, lines 17-26.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an edible film with a thickness of 0.003 to 4 mm as disclosed by Horstmann et al in the method of Zerbe et al as modified by combination of references to provide an edible film having the desired physical characteristics, e.g. strength and texture.

11. Claim 96 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zerbe et al (U.S. 6,660,292) in view of Strobush et al (U.S. 5,881,476) and Yuhki et al (U.S. 5,044,761) as applied to claim 91 above, and further in view of Wittwer (U.S. 4,478,658).

Zerbe et al ('292) as modified above is silent as to the polymer matrix viscosity is about 400 to 100,000 cps. However, forming edible film using polymer matrix with a viscosity between 400 to 100,000 cps is well known and conventional as shown for example by Wittwer. Wittwer discloses a method of forming an edible film for label. The film is formed of material such as cellulose, starches, and carbohydrates (Col 4, lines 54-69) in a solution with water (Col 5, lines 10-24) and has a viscosity of 2,000 to 2,500 cps (Col 10, lines 37-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the matrix with a viscosity of 2,000 to 2,500 cps as disclosed by Wittwer in the method of Zerbe et al '292 as modified by combination of

references to provide a material suitable for high speed commercial application. (See Wittwer, Col 3, lines 57-59)

12. Claims 98, 99, 102, and 103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zerbe et al (U.S. 6,660,292) in view of Strobush et al (U.S. 5,881,476) and Yuhki et al (U.S. 5,044,761) as applied to claim 97 and 101 above, and further in view of Zerbe et al (U.S. 6,231,957).

Zerbe et al ('292) as modified above is silent as to dividing the film into dosage form with equal dimensions, which has the same mass and thickness and packaging each individual dosage forms. However, dividing the film into dosage form with equal dimensions, which has the same mass and thickness and packaging the each individual dosage forms is well known and conventional as shown for example by Zerbe et al ('957). Zerbe et al ('957) discloses a method of forming an edible film. The method includes manufacturing the edible film using conventional coating and drying techniques, cut the film into pieces of a shape and size that meet the requirements of intended application, and packing the films or dosage into containers. (Col 3, line 65 to Col 4, line 16)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to cut the film into pieces of a shape and size that meet the requirement of intended application and packing the films or dosage into containers as disclosed by Zerbe et al ('957) in the method of Zerbe et al ('292) as modified by combination of references to provide an easy-to-use, cheap, and reproducible flavoring or intermediates. (See Zerbe et al ('957), Col 1, lines 18-21)

13. Claims 104 and 110 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zerbe et al (U.S. 6,660,292) in view of Strobush et al (U.S. 5,881,476), Horstmann et al (U.S. 5,629,003), and Yuhki et al (U.S. 5,044,761).

Zerbe et al ('292) discloses a method of forming flavored film. The method includes providing a polymer component such as hydroxypropyl cellulose, modified starch, flavoring and other ingredients in water to form a solution, i.e. a matrix, coating the matrix onto a carrier substrate such as kraft paper or siliconized polyethylene-terephthalate film (Col 5, lines 36-45) and drying the film with hot air and removing the film after drying (Col 6, lines 43-50). Zerbe et al ('292) is silent as to the hot air is applied to the film and the thickness of at least 500 μm and preventing air flow migration and intermolecular forces from forming aggregates or conglomerates to maintaining compositional uniform distribution and deaerating the matrix by slow mixing. However, directing hot air to the bottom of the coated substrate with a hot air current to dry the film is well known and conventional as shown for example by Strobush et al. Strobush et al discloses a method for drying a coating on a substrate. The method includes providing a substrate with a coating applied to a substrate (Col 8, line 66 to Col 9, line 8), providing a drying apparatus, feeding the coated substrate into the apparatus, where air foils (30) located below the coated substrate direct drying gas, i.e. heated air or hot air, to the bottom surface of the coated substrate (Col 9, lines 44-51) with air bars (34) to supply top-side gas or fresh air for added drying or to carry away evaporated solvent or no gas is supplied when top-side gas is not needed or desired (Col 11, lines 15-27) to dry the film without mottle defects, i.e. uniform thickness (Col 12, lines 27-31), or

uniform density, which is without forming aggregates or conglomerates with uniform distribution of components.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to dry the coating on a substrate by directing drying gas to the bottom of the coated substrate as disclosed by Strobush et al in the method of Zerbe et al ('292) to dry the coating on a substrate without mottle and at a higher web speeds. (See Strobush et al, Col 6, lines 21-27) Zerbe et al ('292) as modified above is silent as to the thickness of the film is at least 500 μm and deaerating the matrix by slow mixing. However, forming an edible film with a thickness of at least 500 μm is well known and conventional as shown for example by Horstmann et al. Horstmann et al discloses a method of forming an edible film for multiple dosage units. The method includes providing a polymer matrix with starch and water (Col 3, lines 49-67) and forming the coating layer to a thickness of 0.003 to 4 mm (Col 4, lines 17-26) with the individual dosage includes drugs, confectionary, cosmetics and other food (See abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an edible film with a thickness of 0.003 to 4 mm with either the active as being drugs, confectionary, cosmetics and other food as disclosed by Horstmann et al in the method of Zerbe et al ('292) as modified by combination of references to provide an edible film with any active having the desired physical characteristics, e.g. strength and texture. Zerbe et al ('292) as modified by the combination of references is silent as to deaerating the matrix by slow mixing. However, deaerating a mixture by mixing is well known and conventional as shown for

example by Yuhki et al. Yuhki et al discloses a method of dissolving and deaerating powder material. The method includes feeding a liquid into tank, operating a motor at low to intermediate speeds to sufficiently stir a liquid, feeding a predetermined amount of powder material into the liquid, reducing pressure in tank (Col 4,lines 13-35) and switching the motor to high speed to provide a cavitation action to destroying the bubbles in the liquid (Col 4, lines 36-41), after a number of decompression, the motor is switched to low and returning the tank to atmospheric pressure and prevent cavitation and the bubbles to be supplied into the solution again (Col 4, line 63 to Col 5, line 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to slowly stir the liquid and powder mixture to deaerate the mixture as disclosed by Yuhki et al in the method of Zerbe et al ('292) as modified by the combination of references to dissolve powder material and to deaerated rapidly and easily with no bubbles being developed. (See Yuhki et al, Col 1, lines 5-11)

14. Claim 116 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zerbe et al (U.S. 6,660,292) in view of Strobush et al (U.S. 5,881,476), Mehra et al (U.S. 5,733,575) and Yuhki et al (U.S. 5,044,761).

Zerbe et al ('292) discloses a method of forming flavored film. The method includes providing a polymer component such as hydroxypropyl cellulose, modified starch, flavoring and other ingredients in water to form a solution, i.e. a matrix, coating the matrix onto a carrier substrate such as kraft paper or siliconized polyethylene-terephthalate film (Col 5, lines 36-45) and drying the film with hot air and removing the

film after drying (Col 6, lines 43-50). Zerbe et al ('292) is silent as to the hot air is applied to the bottom of the substrate to dry the film and the matrix includes anti-foaming agent, preventing air flow migration and intermolecular forces from forming aggregates or conglomerates to maintaining compositional uniform distribution and deaerating the matrix by slow mixing. However, directing hot air to the bottom of the substrate with a higher air current at the bottom than the top or substantially no top air flow to dry the film is well known and conventional as shown for example by Strobush et al. Strobush et al discloses a method for drying a coating on a substrate. The method includes providing a substrate with a coating applied to a substrate (Col 8, line 66 to Col 9, line 8), providing a drying apparatus, feeding the coated substrate into the apparatus, where air foils (30) located below the coated substrate direct drying gas, i.e. heated air or hot air, to the bottom surface of the coated substrate (Col 9, lines 44-51) with air bars (34) to supply top-side gas or fresh air for added drying or to carry away evaporated solvent or no gas is supplied when top-side gas is not needed or desired (Col 11, lines 15-27) to dry the film without mottle defects, i.e. uniform thickness (Col 12, lines 27-31) or uniform density, which is without forming aggregates or conglomerates with uniform distribution of components.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to dry the coating on a substrate by directing drying gas to the bottom of the coated substrate as disclosed by Strobush et al in the method of Zerbe et al ('292) to dry the coating on a substrate without mottle and at a higher web speeds. (See Strobush et al, Col 6, lines 21-27) Zerbe et al ('292) as modified above is silent as

to the matrix includes anti-foaming agent and deaerating the matrix by slow mixing. However, providing an anti-foaming agent in the matrix of an edible film is well known and conventional as shown for example by Mehra et al. Mehra et al discloses a method of forming an edible film. The method includes providing a composition with enteric film forming polymer, detackifier, viscosity modifier and an antifoaming agent (Col 2, lines 45-50), which the anti-foaming agent would inherently release oxygen from the composition.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide anti-foaming agent to the matrix as disclosed by Mehra in the method of Zerbe et al ('292) as modified by Strobush et al to provide a less tacky coating or film. (See Mehra, Col 1, lines 65-67) Zerbe et al ('292) as modified by the combination of references is silent as to deaerating the matrix by slow mixing. However, deaerating a mixture by mixing is well known and conventional as shown for example by Yuhki et al. Yuhki et al discloses a method of dissolving and deaerating powder material. The method includes feeding a liquid into tank, operating a motor at low to intermediate speeds to sufficiently stir a liquid, feeding a predetermined amount of powder material into the liquid, reducing pressure in tank (Col 4,lines 13-35) and switching the motor to high speed to provide a cavitation action to destroying the bubbles in the liquid (Col 4, lines 36-41), after a number of decompression, the motor is switched to low and returning the tank to atmospheric pressure and prevent the bubbles to be supplied into the solution again (Col 4, line 63 to Col 5, line 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to slowly stir the liquid and powder mixture to deaerate the mixture as disclosed by Yuhki et al in the method of Zerbe et al ('292) as modified by the combination of references to dissolve powder material and to deaerated rapidly and easily with no bubbles being developed. (See Yuhki et al, Col 1, lines 5-11)

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 91, 93-104, 106, 108-112, 114, 116, 117, and 119 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection with the additional reference to Yuhki et al (U.S. 5,044,761).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sing P. Chan whose telephone number is 571-272-1225. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30AM-11:00AM and 12:00PM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher A. Fiorilla can be reached on 571-272-1187. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SPC

CHRIS FIORILLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
AU 1734